United Nations S/PV.6472

Security Council

Sixty-sixth year

Provisional

6472nd meeting

Friday, 21 January 2011, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Barbalić	(Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Members:	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	China	Mr. Wang Min
	Colombia	Mr. Osorio
	France	Mr. Araud
	Gabon	Mr. Moungara Moussotsi
	Germany	Mr. Wittig
	India	Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri
	Lebanon	Mr. Salam
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Portugal	Mr. Moraes Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	South Africa	Mr. Sangqu
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Ms. Rice

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Institution-building

Letter dated 10 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2011/16)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

11-21268 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Institution-building

Letter dated 10 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2011/16)

The President: I would like to welcome the presence at this meeting of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon.

Under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedures, I would like to invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovenia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine and the United Republic of Tanzania to participate in this meeting.

On behalf of the Council, I warmly welcome the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, His Excellency Mr. José Luís Guterres.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: Under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Germany.

Also under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Peter Schwaiger, Deputy Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, and Mrs. Alice Mungwa, Chargé d'affaires of the Office of the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2011/16, transmitting the concept paper on the item under consideration.

I now invite the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: Mr. President, thank you for initiating today's special debate. Bosnia and Herzegovina's own transition is considerable. Your country has rapidly moved from recipient of international assistance in a conflict and post-conflict environment to contributor to international peace and security as a member of the Security Council. I applaud your readiness to create a platform to share experiences in institution-building and to strengthen our common efforts.

Building effective and legitimate institutions is a difficult task, even under the most favourable conditions. It presents even greater challenges in post-conflict situations. Unfortunately, the track record of international support to institution-building is mixed. We can do better.

Institutions can be critical in sustaining peace and reducing the risk of relapse into violence. Building legitimate and effective institutions that respect and promote human rights therefore must be a central element of the overall peacebuilding effort.

This open debate offers an important opportunity to review the Council's own role in this area and the lessons we have learned. Experience suggests that there are three major lessons we need to apply to our collective efforts.

First, we need to reinforce national ownership and leadership and build on existing institutions. I speak not only of national Governments or core State institutions, but also of local governments, affiliated bodies, communities, the private sector, women's groups and other civil society actors.

Responsive and inclusive institutions can be built only by national actors, using their knowledge of the context, the institutions that do exist and the root causes of conflicts. International assistance has to build on what is already there and can help by identifying, protecting and nurturing latent national capacities. The ongoing review of international civilian capacity is guided by this principle. International capacity assistance should mentor national capacities, never substitute for them.

More nimble and agile systems are also required, including stronger partnerships that can provide the most appropriate civilian capacity, particularly from

developing countries and among women. Access to reliable, early and flexible funding will also advance this goal.

Secondly, we must avoid one-size-fits-all solutions. Attempts to impose an outside model on a post-conflict country can do more harm than good. Each country's institutions develop on their own trajectory and at their own pace. They should be allowed to develop incrementally and with a certain level of experimentation to learn and change. Similarly, institutional change should not be approached as a technical exercise. Rather, it should be viewed and pursued within the broader context of a country's political processes, development and social change.

In Guinea-Bissau, we have found that weak institutions at multiple levels remain one of the main causes of political instability and the lack of socio-economic development.

Institutions are not just bricks and mortar. They are also about informal norms and values, trust and social cohesion. Public confidence in the police, for example, is required for reformed police forces to be effective and to regain authority. Shared norms are necessary to enable legal systems to apply the law equally to all, including different ethnic groups, minorities and women. Respect for international standards, including human rights law, will support public trust in institutions.

Building these intangible qualities and capacities and addressing public perceptions are particularly important in post-conflict societies. International assistance can sometimes facilitate such change, but only if it is highly sensitive to political and social dynamics and how they evolve over time.

Thirdly, institution-building should start early and be sustained not only for years, but decades. In the short term, early and tangible progress needs to be made in a few priority areas to restore confidence and increase the legitimacy of national institutions. Such gains could include providing security in key areas of the country, increasing access to justice systems or expanding health and education services. Quick and focused capacity development can enable key institutions to begin functioning again. Peacekeepers, development and humanitarian actors can play an important role in this regard.

At the same time, premature reform efforts can be risky, particularly if they are taking place under a short-term transitional Government and before a first post-conflict electoral process. Striking the right balance between short- and long-term efforts is critical — and so, too, is the linkage between the two. International efforts have often failed to recognize that building effective institutions is a long-term effort, even in relatively stable conditions. Some progress can be made in three to five years, but expectations need to be realistic. This, of course, has implications for the Council and the missions it mandates.

In recent years, we have seen a marked increased in institution-building mandates from the Council for peacekeeping operations and political missions. Where missions are mandated to support institution-building, including rule of law and security institutions, we must do more to ensure, right from the start, a strong engagement with other international actors. This requires stronger partnerships and coordination among the Council, the Secretariat, United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, international financial institutions, regional organizations and others.

As the Council reviews its mandates and plans for transitions, it could engage these partners more frequently and directly so as to ensure a smooth transition to other actors when our missions leave. In this regard, the Peacebuilding Commission provides an important political platform for countries on its agenda, which can help to focus attention on long-term institution-building priorities and mobilize resources for them, share lessons learned and sustain engagement by the international community.

There is much that we can do to improve our efforts, reduce fragmentation and promote a coherent approach. We can better reflect institution-building in assessments, identify what existing institutions are present and can be developed, and ensure better predictability and accountability for delivery by the United Nations system.

Many of the steps we are taking as part of our peacebuilding and integration agendas are strengthening coherence within the United Nations system, including integrated strategic frameworks that now bring together the missions and United Nations country teams around shared strategic objectives. But we can achieve greater coherence only with the active support of Member States. For example, we need

greater consistency across mandating authorities to facilitate more effective cooperation and smooth transitions. Greater coherence and coordination among donors are equally important, and need to start from the earliest stages.

The Council, for its part, should provide clear and achievable mandates and carefully consider the role of a range of actors within and beyond the United Nations system. The Council and the missions it mandates play a crucial role in building some of the most important institutions in post-conflict countries.

Our success will depend on whether we can deploy the right expertise and resources at the right time, how well we work with our national and international partners, and whether we actually apply the lessons we have learned. Once again, I thank you, Sir, for your commitment to and focus on this vital issue, for your initiative and for sharing your country's example.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. José Luís Guterres, Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste.

Mr. Guterres (Timor-Leste): I thank the Secretary-General for his very informative briefing.

May I, on behalf of Timor-Leste, thank you, Sir, and your country for holding this important thematic debate and for your kind invitation to us to join the Council on this very important occasion. My colleague, Minister of Finance Emilia Pires, Chair of the Group of Seven Plus (g7+), could not be with us as she is with the Prime Minister at our nation's Parliament, discussing the 2011 budget.

This year's budget is focused on developing our country's infrastructure and human capital. The budget process is a key enabling tool in support of our Nation's State-building agenda. Such is the level of public interest in this process that it is broadcast live on television and radio networks for 13 days to the entire country.

Today, the situation in East Timor speaks for itself. We all went through the global financial crisis, yet for three years running Timor-Leste has experienced an average of double-digit economic growth. This places us among the ranks of the top 10 fastest-growing economies in the world. Such growth has seen a 9 per cent decrease in poverty, reversing rising poverty levels that peaked at 50 per cent during the crisis. This decrease saw some 96,000 people lifted out of extreme poverty. The 2010 United Nations Human Development Index recently recorded a rise in rank of 14 places for Timor-Leste.

Unemployment has plummeted, with 96 per cent of men aged between 30 and 49 years currently employed and two in five women now working year-round. In 2007, 85 per cent of all Timorese were employed in the agriculture sector; today, that figure stands at 67 per cent of men and 61 per cent of women. Much of this achievement has been underpinned by the strengthening of institutions.

From the professionalization of the public service to reform of the security sector and the nation's taxation system; and from promoting transparency through the establishment of civil service and anti-corruption commissions to reforming public financial management, institutions have all helped in sustaining peace through the better delivery of public services.

Very soon, data on Government expenditure will be available in real time to the people via an on-line portal, thus ensuring greater transparency and making public spending more efficient. Timor-Leste's national priorities process embodies this national home-grown strategic response to the challenges of post-conflict State-building. The identification of specific national priorities in a sequenced manner has allowed us to identify and then resolve specific issues. From establishing stability to ensuring food security, these issues have required immediate, coordinated and strategic solutions while not distracting us from the larger task of reform.

Emerging from crisis in 2006, our immediate challenge was to establish security and stability so that out people could begin to rebuild. At that crucial moment, Timor-Leste was faced with a defining decision. To whose voice, amidst the offers of international support, should we listen for direction? At this time, I would like to thank the Secretary-General and the Security Council for responding to our request for assistance in a timely manner.

The crisis of 2006 profoundly affected East Timor. During his visit to Timor-Leste, the Secretary-General visited tent camps in Dili, our capital. Around 150,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) lived in tents in East Timor at that time. This is a problem that,

in many places, takes decades to solve. In East Timor, we did our best, with the help of the international community and the representatives of the IDPs themselves, and by discussing ways to find solutions we were able to solve the problem in two years. We therefore thank the Secretary-General and all the countries and experts that helped us in that process.

At the time of the crisis, we enjoyed the support of many countries, 36 of which contributed to the United Nations police mission, reflecting a wide variety of policies and philosophies. Also at that time, we faced the daunting task of establishing public trust in our defence and security forces, as well as trust in our institutions in general. We therefore had to take ownership of the process. With the help of the United Nations, we began security sector reform. Existing divisions in the defence and security forces slowly began to be eliminated through professionalization and better oversight and management. There were also improvements in the security infrastructure and salaries and reforms to the promotions regime, ensuring that merit and ability were restored as key criteria for career advancement. Those reforms also helped to secure peace and stability and to ensure that the nation would not have another crisis.

A second key social programme that has served to support stability involves recognizing our veterans through the provision of pensions. We have allocated $58 million in this year's budget for that purpose. All of us who have experience in conflict situations know how important it is to tackle veterans' issues. Those pensions formed part of a wider integrated social welfare package that now includes the elderly and female-headed households.

Those reforms heralded the beginning of a new compact between citizens and the State. Those successes now allow us to say goodbye to conflict with hope and determination, and welcome to development. That is our nation's motto today.

We find ourselves in a unique position. Having reflected upon our past failures and successes, we feel that we are better placed to communicate the lessons learned and to draw attention to what we consider to have been ineffective when it comes to how aid has been used to support institution-building in post-conflict States.

For Timor-Leste, the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, which we co-chair with the United Kingdom, is a very important channel that we use to engage in open and frank exchanges with fellow member States, as well as with regions and our development partners. At the Dialogue's first meeting, which was hosted by Timor-Leste in April 2010, members indicated that they could not hear their voices echoed within the vast body of work dedicated to addressing conflict in our countries. We could not see ourselves in the road maps, strategies and policy notes put forward.

In response, members agreed to convene four working groups dedicated to combining the breadth of experience that conflict-affected States and international partners had to offer, in order to present a credible and legitimate plan of action for the international community to refer to. The working groups focus on capacity development, under the co-chairmanship of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Japan; aid instruments, under the co-chairmanship of Afghanistan and Sweden; planning processes, under the co-chairmanship of Sierra Leone and the United Kingdom; and political dialogue, under the co-chairmanship of Liberia and the United Nations.

Over time, a bond has been established between countries with direct experience of conflict. In fact, that shared experience provides the bridge necessary to identify and connect with a diverse range of countries, all of which are united in the search for peace. A forum of post-conflict affected countries was thus built, with a foundation grounded in the same basic human challenges we all face and spanning a diversity of cultures, histories and languages. The forum, known as the Group of Seven Plus (g7+), is a new and independent forum of conflict-affected countries and regions that have come together to form a single collective voice to present to the international community.

At the forum's inaugural meeting, held in Dili last year, 13 countries and regions came together to recognize the strong spirit of solidarity between our countries and regions, reflecting a strong desire to work together in the g7+ to share experiences, challenges, failures and successes in order to make a rapid transition to sustainable peace and development. My colleague the Minister of Finance was honoured to have been nominated as Chair.

The g7+ now accounts for almost 350 million people. It is the intention of the Group to own our

nation-building agendas, drawing upon the combined wisdom of those 350 million people to provide the international community with the tools necessary to bring about real change.

Given the experiences of Timor-Leste, and considering the experiences that our fellow States have expressed to us, it is clear that institutions play a critical role in sustaining the shift away from conflict towards the building of more stable, responsive and accountable State. We are therefore concerned when we repeatedly hear of situations where the actions of the international community in that regard fall short of its promises.

As we said at the Millennium Development Goals summit last year, aid delivery and programmes supported by international actors are often inapplicable, unsuitable and incompatible with our agendas and priorities, including with regard to institution-building. On that same occasion, the g7+ challenged the global community to commit to a new paradigm of international engagement in conflict-affected countries and regions.

Other friends tell us of delays in the setting up of trust funds that are not delivering rapidly and flexibly, and thus causing disruptions in aid flows that then impact negatively upon the abilities of emerging institutions to deliver visible results to people.

In my country as well as in other countries, the responsibility for coordinating our development partners' various conflicting policies and practices gives an additional responsibility to our institutions. In order to ensure that we can rely on our partners, we feel that urgent reform and support must be directed towards at least four key areas.

First, international partners must help us build our institutions by working within them. That includes a complete review of the way technical assistance is provided to our countries. This is critical if we seek to strengthen State legitimacy and to build people's trust in emerging institutions, particularly during delicate transitions.

Secondly, one cannot build a nation upon the principles of another. There is no overarching model that can be applied to solve the unique challenges facing our nations. International actors must appreciate the importance of historical context, culture, regional diversity, linguistic complexities, social differences, ongoing political dissonance and the national mentality. All of those are crucial elements in State-building in post-conflict nations.

Thirdly, we must be absolutely clear as to the purpose that institutions are intended to serve, and then be relentless in that pursuit. Function over form must take priority. It is only when the tangible benefits of institutions are seen and felt that citizens' confidence, trust and engagement with State institutions will emerge.

Fourthly, sustained political dialogue within States — between the men and women who make up our communities and Government — is crucial to strengthening democracy and encouraging buy-in, thereby turning State-building into a nation-wide endeavour involving all peoples. In that regard, on behalf of the g7+, I would like to that advantage of the timely opportunity afforded by this debate to suggest the idea of a report of the Secretary-General devoted to the topic of institution-building in conflict-affected States.

In conclusion, all that we seek to achieve is difficult and requires time. However, what the g7+ has prioritized, and what I have presented to the Council today, are specific and, more important, actionable reforms to which the international community must now commit. We will work with our development partners through the International Dialogue to elaborate concrete actions that can improve international engagement in conflict-affected States. An action plan will be ready by the end of the year, and we would be happy to share the results.

As member States made clear in the g7+ statement, our countries understand that urgent action with international partnerships is critical at this time. As Prime Minister Xanana Gusmão recently said, this is not the time to be pessimistic — this is the time for hope and change. It is my sincere hope that the international community and members of the Security Council will take this message and work with us to ensure that our States and nations are also able to make a smooth transition towards peace and stability.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Germany.

Mr. Wittig: I would like at the outset to thank the presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina for convening

this important debate and preparing the draft presidential statement.

I particularly welcome the presence of the Secretary-General and also thank the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, Mr. Guterres, for his comprehensive briefing.

Allow me to make the following remarks in my capacity as the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I have just five more days as PBC Chair, but I will relish them.

The question of national capacity development in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding has been particularly addressed as a main theme in the Secretary-General's 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). Today's debate will allow us to delve deeper into the critical aspect of institution-building in complex post-conflict settings. To this end, I wish to highlight three overarching points from which we can possibly approach institution-building from a peacebuilding perspective.

First, the principle of national ownership, as the Secretary-General has made very clear, should stand at the beginning of any effort to build or rebuild institutions in countries emerging from conflict. Every post-conflict situation is unique, there is no one size that fits all and, thus, approaches to institution-building might vary considerably.

In many cases, most notably such as in post-conflict Bosnia and Herzegovina, we should not assume that the institutions and capacities needed to transform and rebuild the State and society are completely absent. We should encourage ongoing mapping of existing national institutions and capacities in critical peacebuilding areas — such as in the security and justice sectors, basic services and economic revitalization — and build on these existing national capacities. At the same time, a thorough analysis and dialogue with national stakeholders are crucial to prioritization within a broader national peacebuilding vision.

Secondly, there is an important need to develop a common institutional understanding within conflict-torn societies. Institution-building goes beyond establishing and nurturing organizational structures. From power-sharing and rotation, and the active participation of women in decision-making processes, to the fair distribution of wealth and economic opportunities, societies emerging from conflict struggle to rebuild themselves on the basis of new rules of the game.

Thirdly, it is important to keep in mind that entities such as the community, community-based organizations, the private sector and civil society also represent forms of institutions and are essential to advancing national reconciliation, restoring trust, rebuilding the social fabric and generating economic opportunities in conflict-affected societies.

Peacebuilding is certainly a major challenge for the whole United Nations system, but how can the United Nations peacebuilding architecture contribute to institution-building in post-conflict environments? The General Assembly and the Security Council tasked the PBC to focus on, inter alia, institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict.

I wish to offer a few ideas on how the Peacebuilding Commission's role could further evolve in this respect. The Commission's engagement offers a political forum necessary to facilitate among national stakeholders the development of their own prioritization for peacebuilding. The Commission can encourage the identification of the crucial institutions and mechanisms needed to make post-conflict societies more resilient and capable of addressing tensions and challenges through non-violent means.

The Commission's engagement also provides a framework for the development of partnerships and mutual commitments between national Governments and their international partners in support of national peacebuilding priorities. The development and monitoring of its instruments of engagement allows the Commission to sustain focus on institution-building, to promote integration and coherence of efforts among United Nations and non-United Nations actors, and to help address funding gaps where they exist. As an advisory body to the Security Council, the Commission can keep the Council informed of evolving opportunities for and challenges facing peacebuilding in countries on the agenda.

Supporting national capacity development for building, transforming and managing viable institutions at the earliest stage should remain at the heart of our collective efforts. In taking forward relevant recommendations from the 2010 peacebuilding review, the Commission has undertaken

to focus its instruments of engagement on practical approaches to national capacity development around critical peacebuilding priorities.

To conclude, I would like to welcome the joint statement to be delivered by the Chairs of the five country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission later on in this debate. I think that such a joint statement is a first for this body and testifies to the efforts to develop synergies among the five country configurations.

Allow me to add a few brief points in my national capacity.

First, international support to national institution-building should be designed in such a way as to support national ownership, rather than supplant it. One positive example of this is the phased-out involvement of international judges and prosecutors in the Bosnian State Court, which could serve as an important model in this regard.

In Timor-Leste, we have seen that, while the development of national capacities went very well, the early withdrawal of international judges, prosecutors and investigators was, with hindsight, perhaps premature. This can teach us some valuable lessons for the future on how to better sustain the ability of national actors to continue to fight against serious crimes.

Secondly, we need to understand the term "institution-building" in a very broad sense. This is the approach Germany adopts in its bilateral development assistance. Institution-building, or rather State-building, is not only about constructing Government institutions and State capacity; it is about the whole social fabric of a society and how the State interacts with its society. Thus, guaranteeing active participation of women, supporting the establishment of vibrant social organizations and integrating former child-soldiers, for example, into their local communities can all be part of institution-building.

In addition, we must think in medium- and long-term perspectives. For too long, the international community has based its approaches on too narrow and short-term perspectives. Let us face the fact that building States from scratch takes decades, not years. One good example of a nationally owned and broad, long-term institution-building approach is the institution-building plan of Palestinian Prime Minister Fayyad — the Fayyad Plan — launched in 2010. It aims at creating sustainable foundations for a viable democratic Palestinian State and focuses on areas such as good governance, social issues, infrastructure and economic revitalization.

Thirdly, post-conflict institution-building efforts should be combined with efforts to build national capacities in fighting impunity and in vetting human rights violation perpetrators, especially in the areas of judicial reform and police and corrections capacities, to rebuild victims' and public trust in State institutions. To cite a positive example, Germany funds the International Legal Foundation's expert day-to-day mentoring of local lawyers in Afghanistan and the West Bank, which has led to major changes in the practice of lawyers, shifts in lawyers' assumptions about their role in the justice system, shifts in the authorities' views of the importance of counsel, and the establishment of a true culture of defence where none previously existed. Without the involvement of organizations with the necessary local expertise to build national capacity, rule-of-law projects fail to develop adequately the capacities of national justice institutions to strengthen the rule of law and protect the rights of their citizens.

Lastly, the Security Council should address the issue of institution-building as early as possible, especially when mandating, extending or downsizing existing peacekeeping operations. Germany hopes that, especially during this phase, the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission will become closer and more organic. Germany welcomes the most recent initiatives of the Council, such as the informal exchange of views between the Council and the Chairperson of the PBC country-specific configuration on Liberia, and would like to encourage more interaction of this nature in the future. We believe that in this way a more coherent, comprehensive, effective and timely approach to institution-building in particular, and post-conflict situations in general, can be achieved.

In conclusion, we very much look forward to the soon to be released Senior Advisory Group's review of civilian capacities and its recommendations regarding a more effective and comprehensive approach to post-conflict institution-building. We are confident that the review will give us valuable guidance on many aspects that are being touched upon during today's debate.

The President: I thank Mr. Wittig for his briefing and his statement.

I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate the texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): I thank the Secretary-General, Deputy Prime Minister Guterres and Ambassador Wittig for their thoughtful briefings today.

The only way to truly end a war is to successfully build a peace. Old embers left to smolder can ignite into new flames. Old weaknesses left to languish can summon new risks. So we face an important challenge here today — to sharpen all the tools at our disposal in order to do an essential job better. We meet today at the initiative of our colleague from Bosnia and Herzegovina, who has rightly drawn the Council's attention to our topic today. This is fitting. Countries that have themselves endured and overcome the horrors of war are particularly suited to providing leadership — leadership that rests on hard-won wisdom.

In 1995, the Dayton Peace Accords ended a shattering conflict that claimed more than 100,000 lives and drove more than 2 million people from their homes. Through more than 15 years of dedicated effort, Bosnia and Herzegovina has built up national governmental institutions one by one and made them stronger and more effective — from the Ministry of Defence to the customs service, the tax agency and the central bank.

The United Nations, together with a wide range of other actors, has been involved in helping post-conflict countries grapple with their most pressing needs now for more than 20 years, and virtually every conflict-wracked country currently on the agenda of the Council — from Haiti, to Liberia to the Sudan to Afghanistan — seeks effective international assistance to rebuild its institutions.

We have learned important lessons over the past two decades in this field, but we also have work to do in putting them into practice. We all agree that national ownership of the processes of rebuilding and renewal is indispensable, but we still struggle to assist fragile post-conflict Governments so they can set and implement their own priorities. We recognize that women need to play a more active role in peacebuilding, but we still lag in ensuring that women have an equitable stake in making post-conflict decisions and a full voice in running key institutions. We know that the sustainability of a peace process often hinges on strengthening key national institutions, but we still grapple with how best to mobilize effective and timely international assistance in such vital areas as the rule of law and security sectors.

Fortunately, we have collectively acknowledged the challenges and resolved to make headway on them in the year ahead. For example, we have turned to the Peacebuilding Commission to help the democratically elected Government of Liberia to extend State authority beyond Monrovia by establishing regional hubs that will help deliver fair and timely justice in rural communities and make trained police and magistrates more accessible to the population as a whole. We have established new mechanisms and pledged considerable financial assistance to help Haiti consolidated the impressive progress it has made since the terrible earthquake struck a little more than a year ago.

But as many of us said in the Council yesterday, Haiti will continue to face steep challenges unless the international commitment to recovery remains strong and sustained and unless all parties redouble their efforts to strengthen Haiti's critical governing institutions. The country's recovery depends on its ability to find a way to move ahead, even amid complex challenges, including the continuing turmoil surrounding the November 2010 election.

The effectiveness of international assistance to institution-building in Liberia, Haiti and other countries emerging from conflict depends on the United Nations and other multilateral and bilateral actors being able to quickly identify and deploy qualified civilian expertise. We therefore look forward in the coming weeks to the findings of the international review of civilian capacity. We appreciate the briefings to the membership by the Senior Advisory Group, and we hope that the review will emphasize the question of core national capacities in post-conflict States.

We look forward to reviewing specific proposals to make the United Nations own civilian capacities more timely, relevant and flexible and more open to deeper partnerships. Our approach to this review will be guided by our own recent national efforts, as laid out in my Government's first quadrennial diplomacy and development review.

We continue to value the Secretary-General's ongoing efforts to make United Nations field missions more effective, particularly his work to ensure that the top leaders of missions are selected carefully and held accountable.

This meeting is a timely reminder of how essential the work of peacebuilding and institution-building is. There are no easy solutions for societies recovering from conflict, but we must persist in working together to try to craft and implement the specific solutions that each post-conflict society needs. Nothing less than international peace and security hang in the balance.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Sir, for convening this debate on the complex issue of institution-building. There can be no lasting emergence from conflict without reconstruction and national institution-building; when they are lacking, conditions conducive to violence can quickly re-emerge.

As previous speakers have said, and as subsequent ones will as well, there is broad consensus in the Council on the subject of our debate today, namely, on the need to address as soon as possible the process of institution-building in the aftermath of crisis. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding are two sides of the same coin. They must be planned in a forward-looking and integrated manner. There are three ideas that I would like to develop here: the need for national ownership of the process, as my German colleague has already mentioned; the need to define priorities as early as possible; and the importance of long-term funding for these new institutions.

First of all, with regard to national ownership of the process, the building of national institutions, the establishment of the rule of law and the development of practices of democratic governance are essential elements of any stable and peaceful political life. These things cannot be improvised. While it is possible to temporarily set up institutions in the aftermath of war — as we saw in the Democratic Republic of the Congo with the International Committee for Support of the Transition — lasting national institutions can only gain full legitimacy where there is national political will, validated by the people through a referendum or democratic elections. Such national ownership also makes it possible to ensure that the intellectual and human resources of a country are used appropriately and that newly created institutions are adapted to the national context and make it possible for development to occur. Should it gain independence following the referendum that has just been completed, what takes place in Southern Sudan will of course be an exceptional process that the Council will have to monitor very carefully.

Priorities will also have to be defined better. We have to take into account the stakes involved in governance. Corruption is a threat to the stability and security of societies, as it undermines institutions, democratic and moral values and justice. It also compromises lasting development and the rule of law. It is therefore important to define strategies and oversight mechanisms that can enable new institutions to defend themselves against this scourge, in conjunction with the whole host of international partners.

In order to avoid a resumption of conflict, attention must also be paid to the development of institutions in the immediate post-crisis context: democratic and representative bodies, public services that address primary needs and security institutions that ensure the stability of the State while guaranteeing respect for human rights and the rule of law.

Guinea, where everything has to be rebuilt even if it is not emerging from civil war, is a good example of this. President Alpha Condé has indicated that he wants to make security-sector reform one of the areas for immediate attention, along with setting up basic services and encouraging inter-communal dialogue. His project of having military engineering corps participate in public works is also an interesting way of cleaning up a military institution while placing it at the service of the development of the country.

There is no single way of rebuilding institutions. All partners involved must therefore support a strategy that is fully endorsed by the legitimate authorities of the host country.

My third and last point relates to the need for long-term funding. We must address the issue of sustainable funding for newly created or consolidated institutions from the very outset. As a State emerging from crisis rarely has the necessary resources to do so, the international community has to lend support. Let me cite the example of the press, which can be an important pillar for peacebuilding and the promotion of human rights. In that regard, the role played by United Nations Radio in the Great Lakes region must be

acknowledged. The issue of funding radio services following the departure of United Nations missions has to be considered.

The Peacebuilding Commission must also play its role fully in building institutions. It can do so if it adheres to the three requirements that I have just mentioned, namely, national ownership, good governance and financial commitment. We trust that the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission will make it possible for it to better focus its action and bolster its contribution to institution-building in the post-crisis stages.

Mr. Sangqu (South Africa): We thank your delegation, Mr. President, for organizing today's important debate. We also thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for his briefing to the Council. We also wish to thank Mr. Guterres, Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, for sharing his country's experiences on institution-building. We also pay tribute to our colleague Peter Wittig for his outstanding leadership as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission in the past year, as well as thank him for his statement today.

My delegation associates itself with the statement to be delivered later by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

It is certainly true that conflict frustrates not only the emotional and physical aspects of people's lives, but also the economic and social infrastructure of countries, which is the subject of today's debate. By way of further underscoring and addressing the challenges before us, my delegation will focus on four broad issues.

The first issue is the importance of national ownership and local capacities. As has already been mentioned by those who spoke before me today, national ownership of peacebuilding efforts is at the core of creating sustainable institutions in the immediate aftermath of conflict. Although people in post-conflict situations may not be able to articulate their short-, medium- and even long-term priorities, we believe that they can and should be given the opportunity to at least identify them. The international community has the obligation to build upon and advise countries based on priorities that they themselves have identified. Careful identification of those priorities is in most cases a critical determinant for the success or failure of peacebuilding efforts. National actors can be very accurate in identifying the root causes of the conflict.

National capacities at the human and institutional level are important in sustaining peacebuilding efforts. Consequently, the timing of developing these capacities becomes critical in the medium to long term when the attention of the international community on a particular country has waned. In particular, capacity- and institution-building are a foundation for efforts to avert dependency and achieve sustainable peace.

South Africa emphasizes the importance of building local capacities and the provision of training, especially targeting women, in order to enhance existing capacities at the national level, as they are usually willing to participate in the rebuilding of their homes, communities and countries. In this context, South Africa has played a significant part in post-conflict capacity- and institution-building in Africa through multilateral, bilateral and trilateral mechanisms, in such countries as Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone, among others. On behalf of the African Union (AU), South Africa continues to lead the committee on post-conflict reconstruction and development in the Sudan, whose role is expected to become even more critical in the post-referendum phase, especially in Southern Sudan.

Secondly, with regard to the question of coherence, coordination and partnership, South Africa strongly supports the call for greater coherence, coordination and interaction among various United Nations organs and agencies. The United Nations must deliver as one. Other actors, such as the international financial institutions, regional and subregional organizations and donors, also need to work in a coherent and coordinated manner in support of national authorities to address national institution- and capacity-building priorities in post-conflict countries. These priorities include the creation and revival of institutions for the reform of the security sector, strengthening the rule of law, ensuring demobilization, demilitarization and reintegration, and economic recovery.

South Africa is encouraged by the progress made by the Peacebuilding Commission in strengthening its partnerships with regional organizations, in particular the efforts to institutionalize its relationship with the African Union. One of the principles underpinning the

AU's post-conflict reconstruction and development programme is capacity-building for sustainability. Since regional and subregional organizations are in close proximity to post-conflict situations, it seems natural and logical to us that the United Nations should work in partnership with these organizations if it is to maximize the impact of its peacebuilding interventions.

While acknowledging the improvement in the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, we believe that more has to be done. Perhaps we could consider flexibility in our working methods, in order to allow the Commission to effectively play its role in advising the Council on institution-building in post-conflict situations. The growing number of peacekeeping operations, integrated peacebuilding and special political missions with considerable peacebuilding tasks provides an opportunity for the Security Council to make optimal use of the Commission's advice. Specifically, in consultation with the Commission, we encourage the Council to incorporate peacebuilding tasks related to institution-building into all of its peacekeeping mandates. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding should be mutually reinforcing in the pursuit of lasting peace for countries in conflict.

Concerning the question of mobilizing resources, as our French colleague has already mentioned, institution- and capacity-building in post-conflict countries require a substantial injection of resources. In this regard, we believe that timely, sustainable and predictable financing remains a crucial ingredient in realizing peacebuilding objectives. We therefore emphasize the need for the United Nations to consider utilizing sustainable mechanisms, including assessed contributions, as a means of kick-starting peacebuilding activities in countries emerging from conflict, especially for early institution-building efforts.

In conclusion, South Africa welcomes the adoption of the draft presidential statement before us on post-conflict peace- and institution-building. South Africa appreciates United Nations efforts, through its multifarious organs and agencies, towards making the world a better place to live. We also look forward to the report on the review of international civilian capacities early this year.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are grateful to the Secretary-General and the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, as well as to the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, for their contributions to today's discussion.

In its meetings the Security Council regularly considers issues of post-conflict peacebuilding, both within the framework of a generalized review and in the context of individual countries. The peacebuilding activities of the Organization have taken on a global scale and demand our careful attention. It is symbolic that the initiator of today's discussion is a Council member with first-hand experience of crisis, having gone through a brutal armed conflict and being a recipient of peacebuilding assistance. In our view, such an insider perspective will help further optimize United Nations mechanisms and increase our common understanding of existing problems.

We believe there is a need to highlight a number of specific principles. First, and most important, is that the logic of any peacebuilding operation is a function of the principle of national responsibility for defining its priorities and the approaches to their implementation. Only national leaders can ensure sustainable peaceful development. Mentorship and templates must be avoided.

Secondly, the key component in successful post-conflict peacebuilding is the creation and strengthening of national institutional capacities. This should become — in facts, not just words — the system-wide priority for the entire Organization. Achieving lasting peace and stability is only possible when every aspect of responsibility and ownership lies with national players.

Thirdly, any assistance from the international community should be provided with the consent of national Governments and with respect for the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity. The success of peacebuilding efforts in Africa, the Balkans, Timor-Leste, Afghanistan, the Middle East and other regions is rooted in the ability to take into account the interests and priorities of host States. Assistance from the international community should not be imposed from outside. There can be no predetermined recipes for assistance. The specifics of every State and the nature of every conflict must be taken into account. In some cases, robust international patronage is essential in order to help form viable State institutions capable of effectively resolving the people's most pressing problems: establishing security and stability, stimulating the economy and rebuilding social

infrastructure. Such international trusteeship does not cancel out the principle of providing for the gradual transfer of responsibility for a country's situation to its national authorities and for an early definition and formation of a clear exit strategy. Artificially maintaining such patronage can squander its purpose and become counterproductive. It should not become a brake on the path to strengthening national Statehood.

The United Nations unquestionably plays a special role in coordinating international post-conflict and socio-economic reconstruction efforts. The Organization possesses unique legitimacy and has accumulated invaluable experience. Even today, however, this role presents many complexities and demands the coordinated efforts of the Secretariat, the Organization's programmes and funds, Member States, regional organizations and international financial institutions. In this regard, we support the Secretary-General's drive towards increasing the effectiveness of United Nations efforts in the area of post-conflict response, strengthening the Secretariat's organizational toolbox and ensuring the cohesiveness of its work. In the peacebuilding field, the United Nations and its missions rarely operate in isolation. Other international presences are often working alongside them, as in, for example, Afghanistan and Iraq. Relationships in such cases should be defined in strict compliance with Security Council decisions.

Many of the initial tasks of peacebuilding — such as in the area of security-sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration — now fall to United Nations peacekeeping operations. In accomplishing its chief task, namely, enabling the peace process to move forward, United Nations peacekeepers play a critically important role in creating the conditions conducive to peacebuilding assistance on a larger scale. Considering the growing complexity and multifaceted nature of peacebuilding mandates, it would be rational to entrust peacekeepers only with the initial reconstruction tasks. It is imperative that we exploit the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission and of regional organizations, international financial institutions and donors in subsequent stages of post-conflict peacebuilding.

We would like to express our gratitude to the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina for preparing the draft presidential statement on the topic of today's meeting, which we are ready to support.

Mr. Osorio (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to commend you, Mr. President, for convening this debate on a very relevant issue in terms of the functioning of States and their co-existence in the aftermath of conflict. Focusing the discussion on institution-building demonstrates its value for generating conditions that can ensure sustainable peace. The statements by the Secretary-General, the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste and Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, reflect the progress that has been achieved and the tasks that remain before us on this issue.

Peacebuilding is primarily a national responsibility, and I believe we all agree on that. Countries recovering from the effects of conflict require tools to ensure good governance, strengthen the rule of law and channel economic and social development. In this regard, the international community is responsible for providing support for national agendas and priorities aimed at creating, restoring or reforming institutions in order to achieve effective administration and national capacity-building. The actions of the international community, including States, the United Nations, regional organizations and international financial institutions, should be aimed at supporting programmes that encourage a country's stability and viability. That is why the leadership of the State in question is paramount at every stage of the process.

Rebuilding the institutional structure that sustains a State affects every area of peacekeeping and peacebuilding. This viewpoint must be present from the earliest stages of the planning and executing of peacekeeping operations. Strategies aimed at establishing stable and lasting peace must be adapted to the specificities of each individual case. This understanding must guide the Council's discussion and decisions in order to ensure that the measures adopted respond to the political, economic and cultural characteristics of each situation.

The preparation and implementation of institution-building require from the outset the participation of the State and the use of existing national capacities to ensure the transition towards stability and long-term development and to help progressively to reduce dependence on the international community.

Conflicts weaken or lead to the dissolution of important civil society structures. There are many examples. Therefore, it is essential to generate sustainable economic activities that guarantee a steady income, a decent standard of living and the reconstruction of the social fabric. That will help to prevent the re-emergence of the conditions at the root of the conflict. Likewise, we must ensure that all actors involved in the peacebuilding process work in a coordinated and consistent way in order to avoid the duplication of efforts and to ensure the efficient use of available resources.

Colombia believes that the Peacebuilding Commission is destined to play a central role in meeting the special needs of countries emerging from conflict. It should promote recovery, reintegration and reconstruction and help to lay the foundations of sustainable development. Accordingly, it should promote institution-building and the regular use of its advisory role to the Security Council. Moreover, if the United Nations is to be more effective throughout the conflict cycle, the Security Council must make use of the conflict prevention tools at its disposal to develop actions to prevent the emergence and recurrence of situations that threaten or undermine peace. The experiences and lessons of all countries in that regard should serve to foster solid institution-building that ensures the transition to lasting peace.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this timely open debate. I also take this opportunity to thank the Secretary-General for an excellent presentation. I welcome Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste Mr. José Luís Guterres, and congratulate him on the important strides that his country has made in recent years. We very much appreciate his thoughtful comments on State-building, based on Timor-Leste's own very successful experience. I also thank Ambassador Peter Wittig for his important remarks on peacebuilding.

Brazil aligns itself with the statement to be made by Ambassador Jan Grauls on behalf of the five Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission country-specific configurations. I will now make brief remarks in my national capacity.

The strengthening of Government institutions is key to achieving sustainable peace in post-conflict countries. In several parts of the world, the fragility or the lack of institutions makes it difficult to solve or mitigate serious political, social or economic problems, thus increasing the risk of relapse into conflict. We are encouraged to note that a consensus has evolved on the need for a comprehensive approach to peacebuilding and institution-building.

The efforts of the international community should be focused not only on supporting institutions in the field of justice and security, as it is also important to enhance the capacity of the institutions in charge of economic revitalization, public administration and the provision of basic services. Those institutions are indispensable to promoting poverty reduction, which is a powerful tool for addressing some of the root causes of social strife and building long-lasting peace. Likewise, social policies have a positive impact on the political process, since they empower groups that were once excluded from making decisions to do so at both the local and the national levels. The contribution of women must be continuously emphasized, taking into account two dimensions: on the one hand, their presence in Government institutions and, on the other, the existence of institutions and governmental bodies capable of ensuring their fundamental rights and needs.

That is one reason why institution-building must start at the earliest stage of the post-conflict period. There are a number of ways in which the United Nations system can and does assist societies emerging from conflict in that regard. The development arm of the Organization, the centrepiece of which is the United Nations Development Programme, is indeed expected to have assistance in institution-building as one of its main tasks.

Nevertheless, that endeavour is to be undertaken by all parts of the United Nations system, according to their respective responsibilities. In that regard, it is encouraging to see the growing recognition of the need to resort to peacekeepers as early peacebuilders. We seem to be finally discarding the traditional approach, by which peacekeeping and peacebuilding were sequential and unrelated stages in the path towards peace.

Assistance in institution-building is also a task to be undertaken in coordination with international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, whose valuable experience and expertise can provide assistance tailored to the specific needs of post-conflict countries.

As has been stressed by previous speakers, national ownership is vital to peacebuilding processes. International support to building and strengthening institutions must be fully aligned with the interests of the countries concerned. That is particularly relevant to the United Nations in those places where United Nations missions are deployed.

That is why one guiding principle for proper assistance with regard to civilian capacities should be to tap into and help build national capacities, thus avoiding the damaging consequences of brain drain and dependency on foreign expertise. Partnerships with Member States, in particular South-South cooperation, are particularly important to achieving that goal. We are confident that the current review of international civilian capacities will submit concrete recommendations to ensure that that principle is translated into practical arrangements.

Finally, as Chair of the Guinea-Bissau configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission, Brazil is committed to promoting national ownership, nurturing national capacities, and assisting in the consolidation of national institutions as we move forward in helping Guinea-Bissau to consolidate peace and promote its development.

Mr. Salam (Lebanon): Allow me first to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this important and timely debate. Allow me also to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, Ambassador Peter Wittig and the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, Mr. José Luís Guterres, for their briefings and presentations.

It is well known that conflict weakens institutions and affects State capabilities. In the post-conflict phase, the scale of required institution-building varies from one country to another. It depends largely on the degree of institutionalization existing prior to the eruption of conflict, as it is easier to resuscitate institutional memory than to establish it from scratch. However, peacebuilding is not only about rebuilding what existed before the outbreak of violence. Actually, it may be the case that existing structures are part of the root causes of the conflict. Therefore, the goal of any peacebuilding operation must be to establish stable and accountable institutions that are able to provide good governance.

In that context, institution-building should be understood and pursued in its wider sense, not only to encompass organizational reforms, but also to instill a value system that would promote the peaceful settlement of disputes over the long term. The early engagement of civil society is also important, as it can help to promote a culture of greater transparency, accountability and the active participation of the population in defining its actual needs.

Institution-building is both a goal and a means to an end in complex peacebuilding processes. It should be integrated, along with other peacebuilding goals, into a national peacebuilding strategy serving as a framework that brings together peace, security and development. A successful peacebuilding strategy must strike a delicate balance between the need to quickly produce an impact and dividends on the ground, on the one hand, and to support long-term capacity-building, on the other, with the overarching goals of transforming the causes of the conflict and laying the foundations for justice and durable peace.

As others have already stressed, the greatest lesson to be learned from previous efforts at building institutions in conflict-ridden States is undoubtedly that there is no one-size-fits-all approach. Building functional institutions requires tailored approaches based on thorough analysis of the root causes and drivers of the conflict.

Institution-building should be nationally owned from the outset and involve leveraging existing capacities. Therefore, the United Nations and donors should seek out local initiatives, however nascent, and encourage them to grow. In addition to national ownership, equally important is the availability of sustained attention and financial resources for long-term tasks. There is often a gap between peacebuilding aims and the resources required in the long run, as funding tends to diminish precisely at the point when it is most needed. In this area, the Peacebuilding Commission could play a critical role in mobilizing additional resources to continue over a sustained period of time.

Post-conflict institution-building undoubtedly determines the shape and direction peace and stability will take. It is thus our responsibility to provide the necessary means for such an undertaking to succeed.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): I want to commend your delegation, Mr. President, for bringing the focus of our peacebuilding discussion on institution-building for the first time. I extend our thanks to the Secretary-General for his insightful briefing, and we especially wish to

welcome Deputy Prime Minister José Luis Guterres for sharing the experience of his country with us in this debate.

We owe a great debt to Peter Wittig speaking in his capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We believe that his dual role is a valid sign of the Security Council's deepening relationship with the PBC, from which we can only benefit.

Institution-building, an integral part of peacebuilding, encompasses more than establishing and nourishing organizational structures. It includes the value systems that underpin such organizations. Indeed, many civil conflicts erupt or recur not because of a lack of organizational structures such as courts, police and other security services, but because of deep disagreements over the sharing of political power and economic resources among different groups. The task of post-conflict institution-building revolves as much around rehabilitating organizational structures as it does around restoring the norms and values that guide the effective functioning of the economy, society and politics.

Although the work of the various actors in the United Nations system is to be commended, the restoration of core institutions cannot be outsourced, and accordingly it is imperative that, from the inception of each peacebuilding exercise, the United Nations be mindful of its role as a facilitator. National actors should always take the lead in articulating the needs of their countries, with the United Nations providing necessary assistance in addressing those needs.

As speakers before me have already stated, the fundamental need for people to own their own peace cannot be ignored. Every post-conflict society must be the author of its destiny. Any peacebuilding project that is not rooted in local knowledge, local expertise, local engagement and local will is doomed to fail right after the departure of the Blue Helmets. It is equally true that building a sustainable peace is the primary responsibility of the nation State. The Government and people of each country must assume the task of long-term institution-building.

We are gratified that the early findings of the civilian capacity review of the Peacebuilding Support Office point to the need to assess local needs and existing local capacities, including the capacity to absorb assistance, before we set about deploying international capacities. It is encouraging to note that the United Nations Development Programme and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations are reviewing both their needs and capacity assessment methodologies to better calibrate their work on the ground.

Despite a degree of progress, more predictable long-term financing for institution-building must remain high on our agenda. As Nigeria has previously stated, the lack of pre-mandate funding can slow progress in implementing important transitional mandates, and we therefore call for further consideration of how the Organization might resolve this very important issue. The two new funding facilities and the revised funding ceiling for urgent peacebuilding support from the Peacebuilding Fund are very welcome innovations. We encourage donors to participate in this and other multilateral funds that support institution-building and post-conflict recovery activities.

Regional actors also have an important role to play in this context, and we note in particular the African Union's Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development Policy Framework. For its own part, Nigeria provides support for regional and international peacebuilding efforts. Across Africa, particularly West Africa, we support activities such as security sector reform. In addition, since 2004 all three arms of Nigeria's armed forces have been working assiduously with civil society to mainstream peacebuilding into international peacekeeping operations. The integration of peacebuilding into the training curriculums of a number of Nigeria's military institutions is aimed at equipping the armed forces with skills that will allow intervention supportive of a more lasting peace within communities following the cessation of hostilities.

If properly managed, with a clear division of labour, predictable funding and an exit strategy, the expertise of the international community can be invaluable in rebuilding institutions, particularly in the security and rule of law sectors. We eagerly anticipate the completion of the civilian capacity review so that the United Nations can draw from it lessons on better coordination, better cohesion and more effective partnerships with national, subregional and regional actors. In this way we can help post-conflict countries restore security, accountability and legitimacy, all of which lie at the very core of responsible statehood.

Every nation aspires to stand on its own two feet. Let us use every means at our disposal to make that aspiration a realizable one. I want to reiterate Nigeria's commitment to peacekeeping and peacebuilding. As an active and responsible member of the PBC, we will continue to lend our support to the efforts of the United Nations in assisting post-conflict societies.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): The sustained attention of the Council to peacekeeping and peacebuilding is indicative of the fact that it recognizes that the success or failure of peacekeeping and peacebuilding will determine the continuing relevance of the United Nations and of this Council to many troubled parts of the world. My delegation would therefore like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate to focus on what is probably the most critical component of the peacebuilding agenda. We would also like to thank you for the concept paper (S/2011/16, annex), which we found extremely useful.

I thank the Secretary-General for his remarks, and I would also like to express our appreciation to the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste for his presence here and for his presentation on the remarkable strides that his country has made. I also thank the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Wittig of Germany.

Out of respect for the President's injunction to confine our remarks to four minutes, I will present only a summary of what I have to say. A more detailed paper has been circulated.

Peace cannot be restored to post-conflict societies and their citizens cannot be freed from fear and want unless national authorities are able to govern effectively. The capacity for effective governance, in turn, depends on the existence of institutions that enable these authorities to respond effectively to the aspirations of people.

Over the past two decades, this Council made huge investments in terms of manpower and resources in designing and running multidimensional peacekeeping operations. These have shown, at best, mixed results. A handful has delivered outcomes that may be termed satisfactory. Many have meandered as they attempted over a decade or more to be equal to the task of implementing their complex and ambitious mandates.

Unfortunately, conflicts persist, and we are now in the midst of another paradigm shift. One dimension of this shift — the attempt to define the scope of peacebuilding — is becoming ever clearer as fragile States define areas in which the international community can and is willing to support their nation-building activities. A second dimension — the relation between peacekeeping and peacebuilding — is also being clarified. However, a third dimension — the organizational context of peacebuilding — continues to lack uniformity. Some peacebuilding efforts are being managed by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, others by the Department of Political Affairs and yet others by the United Nations resident coordinator system. At another level, the Peacebuilding Commission is working to expand its effectiveness. Peacebuilding, therefore, is very much a work in progress.

India brings to the table almost 60 years of experience in peacekeeping. We have contributed more peacekeepers to more peacekeeping operations than any other nation. We have also participated in every type of peacekeeping operation from truce supervision to the current generation of complex peacekeeping operations. Peacekeepers are early peacebuilders, and Indian peacekeepers have been among the earliest United Nations peacebuilders.

Our experience in transforming a colonial legacy into a modern, dynamic nation that enjoys both democracy and a rapidly growing economy has made Indian peacekeepers instinctively understand that no peace can be effective unless it is accompanied by the growth of local institutions. Indian peacekeepers in the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia, the United Nations Operation in Somalia II, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United Nations Mission in the Sudan, the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti and elsewhere have made conscious efforts to assist local authorities in restoring national structures that had collapsed during conflict. Our peacekeepers have donned peacebuilding hats and attempted to restore administrative processes, strengthened local policing and activated judicial mechanisms in the areas they have served. They have attempted to work through indigenous mechanisms for conflict resolution and mediation in order to strengthen these local institutions so that they become viable political institutions. They

have tried to get educational institutions to function and provided services, such as livestock clinics, to help local economies get going.

Political and administrative institutions that decentralize governance are, in our experience, the key to nation-building. Institutions must be locally relevant and include all stakeholders, particularly the weak and underprivileged.

India launched the largest-ever exercise in democratic decentralization about two decades ago. Administrative and legislative powers were transferred to village- and district-level bodies, and considerable thought and effort were devoted to making these institutions locally relevant. The key to the success of these institutions, we have found, lies in what we call inclusiveness. Our process of democratic decentralization has ensured the election of about 1 million women to representative offices at all levels. Empowering those who have traditionally been at the margins of society has strengthened and transformed both democracy and governance in our country.

Inclusiveness works in interesting ways. The decision of the Government of India to aggressively recruit women police personnel allowed us to field a female formed police unit — the first such formation composed entirely of women — in UNMIL. We understand that the presence of these Indian women police personnel has not only assisted in restoring faith in the local law enforcement system, but has served as an example to Liberian women.

No amount of international will can replace national will and commitment. Moreover, peacebuilding cannot be undertaken in a hurry. Our role as peacebuilders has to be to assist, through long-term and patient involvement, the creation of an environment in which this local will is allowed to express itself. It is also to provide the resources and the expertise that are often lacking in societies struggling to re-engineer themselves. All of this calls for the international community to make available a predictable and appropriate level of resources over extended periods.

It is hard to avoid the feeling that the United Nations presence on the ground is a ponderous bureaucracy rather than a lean institution that is quick to adapt and respond. Symptomatic of this malaise is the fact that the Secretariat takes up to 200 days to fill positions in the field, leading to worrying vacancy levels. The sourcing of these capacities must be driven by the needs of national authorities and not by priorities of the donors. It also stands to reason that these capacities need to be sourced from the Governments of nations that have experience of relevance to these national authorities.

Serious consideration must also be given to the idea of expanding the secondment of staff to the United Nations. This would allow the United Nations to rapidly access necessary capabilities, deploy them swiftly and allow rapid scaling up and down. It is also likely to be more economical.

In concluding, I would like to stress that, as a responsible global citizen, India will not be found lacking in responding to the challenge of maintaining international peace and security through the peacebuilding process. Through the Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation programme, we give training to some 5,000 foreign students and experts from 158 countries around the globe in approximately 220 courses. Similarly, through lines of credit, South-South cooperation and the India Development Initiative, we have contributed to nation-building activities in various countries. India has also contributed to peacebuilding through innovate multilateral mechanisms, such as the India-Brazil-South Africa initiatives in Haiti, Guinea-Bissau and other nations.

Mr. Moungara Moussotsi (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): at the outset, my delegation commends the initiative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to organize this debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, and more specifically on the reconstruction of institutional architecture in countries emerging form conflict. I would also like to express our gratitude to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and Mr. José Luís Guterres, Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, for their valuable contributions to the present debate. Allow me finally to thank Ambassador Peter Wittig, Permanent Representative of Germany and Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, for his enlightened leadership in that role.

Peacebuilding is one of the most difficult and complex tasks of the United Nations. Over the years, it has also become one of the most important, insofar as it prevents countries emerging from devastating conflicts from sinking back into violence.

Rebuilding institutional architecture is an extremely critical issue and calls for particular attention, as reflected in today's debate. My delegation would therefore like to focus on three issues we deem to be important: the assistance that the United Nations and the international community as a whole can provide to these countries; the question of national ownership; and aspects relating to partnerships.

Institution-building in post-crisis countries is an important pillar of peacebuilding. This is an issue that must be taken into account as soon as hostilities cease in order to establish viable and lasting peace. Indeed, a number of post-conflict countries lack effective institutions capable of preserving a painfully won peace. In other cases, the pre-existing institutions themselves are the cause of conflict.

The United Nations and the international community must ensure that peace so achieved is preserved. This approach allows for peacebuilding, to prevent any resurgence of conflict, and is fully consistent with my country's conception of conflict prevention.

International assistance, however, should not obscure the responsibility of the authorities and other national actors or their participation in the process aimed at rebuilding the institutions of their country. Assuming that responsibility would lead them to greater ownership of the institution-building process and the strengthening of national capacities.

With regard to issues related to the partnership among the various players in the reconstruction or strengthening of institutions, coherence and coordination among them is necessary to avoid overlapping tasks. In Sierra Leone, for example, the establishment of a single programme for change, bringing together the areas of security, development and policy, has considerably streamlined the work of the administration and has at the same time strengthened the coherence of its actions and the country's taking charge of the peace process.

Coherence must begin at the level of the United Nations, through the clear definition and distribution of tasks among the various bodies involved in efforts to rebuild institutions in post-conflict countries. We welcome the efforts undertaken by the Peacebuilding Commission in that regard. Next, coherence must extend to partnerships with regional and subregional organizations. They are sometimes better placed to resolve some issues and to consider, with the host country, the question of institution-building.

We also welcome the initiatives undertaken by the Peacebuilding Commission to strengthen relations between the United Nations and the World Bank, which have enabled the Bank to take better account of the priority needs of countries such as the Central African Republic during 2010. We encourage the Commission, in its coordinating role, to develop partnerships with all financial and donor institutions able to help the countries on its agenda. The Commission should also involve all actors, including women's organizations.

In their report on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex), the co-facilitators recommended that special attention be devoted to the partnership between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. Gabon considers their recommendations a substantial contribution. The Council would stand to benefit from consulting with the Commission throughout all phases of peace operations, from their preparation through their renewal and to their withdrawal.

As we have often underscored, Gabon believes that the issue of institution-building in countries emerging form armed conflict should be planned for, as circumstances require, when a peacekeeping operation is established. Furthermore, we should not lose sight of the fact that control of the political and security process is, in our view, a central element of the comprehensive peacebuilding strategy. To that end, we urge our financial partners to continue their efforts to finance reconstruction.

We welcome the fact all of those elements have been taken into account in the draft presidential statement that has been submitted to us, which we fully support.

Mr. Moraes Cabral (Portugal): Thank you, Mr. President, for convening this timely and important debate. It is most suitable that we address this issue under your presidency, given your country's remarkable transition from the post-conflict stage to a stable democracy. I also thank the Secretary-General for his important statement.

I wish to extend a most cordial welcome to Mr. José Luís Guterres, Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, a country that is also a paradigm of today's subject and a success in the United Nations'

peacebuilding efforts. Today, less than eight years after its independence, Timor-Leste is a democracy with stable institutions, looking confidently towards the future. That is due to the success of the peacebuilding efforts carried out in Timor-Leste, with institution-building at the centre. But it is mainly due to the will of the Timorese people and their political leaders' vision of national ownership and leadership. Portugal is honoured, alongside the other members of the Portuguese-speaking community, to be deeply associated with the successful path Timor-Leste has followed.

In the early stages of the United Nations reform process, Mozambique and Portugal jointly proposed the creation of a framework within the United Nations system that would help to bridge the gap between security needs and the need to rebuild stable institutions that would allow Governments in post-conflict situations to effectively pursue their main tasks. Without that, stability would be elusive and relapse into conflict would be a serious possibility. In time, that proposal led to the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), which has been chaired by our colleague Peter Wittig, whom I congratulate on his commitment and leadership. I must say that I share his analysis and suggestions concerning enhancing the role of the PBC.

It is now a common assumption that peacekeeping and peacebuilding should be seen as an integrated effort and no longer as sequential activities, and that peacebuilding activities should begin as soon as the situation on the ground so permits, well within the span of the foreseeable duration of a peacekeeping operation and throughout its cycle.

The United Nations must enhance its capacity to define integrated strategies from the outset and to coordinate the activities of the different actors on the ground — those in charge of security and the development agencies and non-governmental organizations — enhancing interaction with all the relevant stakeholders, including regional and subregional organizations, neighbouring countries, peacebuilding configurations and troop- and police-contributing countries. Much has been done in that sense, but more still needs to be done.

Only with legitimate, credible and resilient institutions will a State be able to discharge its functions and meet the expectations of its citizens. Only such institutions will be able to address the many issues that remain in post-conflict situations and to bring the resolution of political disputes into the political process.

Each country is a different and specific case. General recipes are dangerous, to say the least. But two further elements are common and equally important in all peacebuilding strategies: economic and social development, and national ownership.

Institution-building alone will not suffice, since no country will achieve sustainable peace and stability without economic and social development. Unemployment, especially youth unemployment, must be addressed at an early stage of peacebuilding efforts through concrete, focused initiatives. International economic aid should be concentrated on projects that take into account the economic, social and even cultural realities of the country, its specific capacities and the potential they offer for foreign investment. Adequate management of natural resources should also be incorporated early into development programmes and infrastructure reconstruction. Development of national capacities must be a constant objective in all areas.

There is an obvious link between development and peace. The nature of that link is perhaps not totally clear, nor can one build upon a casual relationship between the two. But they are surely mutually reinforcing.

No one can better understand the situation in a country than the people who live there. No foreign commitment can replace their will, without which no peacebuilding effort will be sustainable. The centrality of national actors is therefore indispensable.

The importance of national ownership in post-conflict peacebuilding is well known to all of us. The partnership between the State and the international partners must be based on a shared strategic understanding of the objectives and the way forward, with clear common goals, permanent and effective dialogue and interaction with the people of the country — the authorities, opposition parties and civil society as a whole. It must include a smooth exit strategy for the international actors. Gender issues and the instrumental role that women play in economic recovery, social cohesion and political legitimacy, expanding the scope of national capacities, are also of particular importance.

Peacebuilding is also an exercise in managing the expectations of the authorities and the civil society of the country in question and those of the mission and other international stakeholders. That can be done only through constant dialogue and through a real grasp of political, social, economic and cultural realities and their dynamics and evolution.

National ownership contributes to institution-building, and, on the other hand, institution-building reinforces national ownership and national responsibility, thus paving the way for a successful exit strategy of the international partners and self-sustained peace and stability.

The European Union has long been committed to supporting institutional development in post-conflict countries. In that regard, as a member of the European Union, Portugal naturally shares the position that will be expressed by its representative during this debate.

In concluding, I would like to recall an expression of Sergio Vieira de Mello, who personifies United Nations involvement both in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Timor-Leste. He said "The UN is an instrument, a frame, an engine, a dynamic, as conciliatory, as innovative, as successful as Member States wish it, allow it and make it be." That is our common challenge and our shared responsibility. Bearing that in mind, let me assure the Council of Portugal's commitment to contribute to a more effective and coherent international responsible to post-conflict peacebuilding.

Mr. Wang Min (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank Bosnia and Herzegovina for taking the initiative to convene this thematic debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and institution-building. We welcome the attendance of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and Deputy Prime Minister Guterres of Timor-Leste. I also thank Ambassador Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, for his statement.

Peacebuilding is the common challenge facing post-conflict countries. It is also one of important means through which the international community helps prevent relapse into conflicts.

In the peacebuilding process, there are questions that are not new but that have not yet been effectively addressed, such as the following. In post-conflict countries, how can peacebuilding work evolve at an early stage so that a transition from stability to sustainable peace and development can be achieved? How can coherence and coordination between the United Nations and other relevant parties be strengthened so that effective partnership can be established? In what ways should the United Nations and the international community provide support and help to post-conflict countries in peacebuilding, especially institution-building? In that context, China would like to raise the following four points.

First, it is imperative that the post-conflict countries bear the primary responsibility for peacebuilding in their own countries. All sides must fully respect the sovereignty and will of the countries concerned. National ownership and national capacity must be enhanced so as to lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development. The role of the international community is to provide assistance rather than substitution.

Secondly, national capacity-building is the key to success in peacebuilding in post-conflict countries. The United Nations and the international community must prioritize peacebuilding tasks, including institution-building, in the light of the specificities and circumstances of post-conflict countries and must provide timely and tailored technical support and assistance. In that regard, it is important to deploy competent international civil servants with the right skills to the post-conflict countries in a timely manner and to vigorously help countries concerned to provide training in the talents needed.

Thirdly, prioritization is important in helping peacebuilding in post-conflict countries. In such countries a myriad of tasks must be restarted from scratch, in a complex environment with fragile political and security bases. The international community's first task is to help the countries concerned ensure basic security, promote the political process, provide basic services, support core government functions and reinvigorate the economy and development. The primary goal of the international community's support in institution-building is to consolidate peace, safeguard stability, revive the economy and enhance the rule of law. In that process, full consideration must be given to the priority needs of the countries concerned and full attention must be paid to their views in formulating peacebuilding strategies.

Fourthly, the United Nations and the international community need to enhance coordination so that

conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and promoting development can advance in tandem and in an orderly manner. That entails setting up comprehensive strategies for peacebuilding so that experiences and lessons can be drawn quickly and overlapping and waste of resources can be avoided.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): We are grateful to you, Mr. President, for bringing the critical issue of post-conflict institution-building to the Council today. We have much to learn from your experience, as well of that of East Timor. I welcome the presence of the Deputy Prime Minister, as well as, earlier in the day, the Secretary-General.

Helping build institutions is at the heart of building peace. Without security for the State and people, the economy and public services cannot operate. Without revenue, there will be nothing with which to pay for government services and functions and no confidence in the financial viability of the State. Without the rule of law, there will be no accountability. And there is a need to build the institutional capacity to resolve conflict peacefully.

The process of building institutions is not solely a technical exercise, but also a complex political one. It is often a core part of a peace agreement and is key in shaping the relationship between the State and society. It will also determine the level of confidence in the peace process and the extent to which public expectations are met. Achieving progress, particularly in the security and justice sectors, is a prerequisite for the sustainable withdrawal of peacekeepers.

But the process of building institutions is also a prerequisite for broader conflict prevention. Fragility and conflict are symptoms of institutional failure to manage stress, such as resource scarcity, climate change, corruption or organized crime.

The year ahead will again be a very challenging year for the United Nations in supporting institution-building. Challenges include supporting the needs of post-referendum Sudan, extending the protection of civilians and the rule of law in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, and expanding protection and access to justice in Liberia outside of the capital — for which the Peacebuilding Commission will play a key role.

But blockages in peacebuilding are all too often due to failures or delays in institution-building. Those may be due to political reasons. But they are also due to continuing weaknesses in the ability of the United Nations to provide assistance.

There are five issues that I believe we need to focus on if we are to succeed this year.

First, time is critical. There needs to be the political and bureaucratic will to deliver on time and with sufficient scale to meet the volume of needs. That applies internally to the United Nations system but equally to Members States, such as through their engagement on the boards. Business as usual is not enough.

Secondly, United Nations support for justice and security sector reform needs to be much more effective. For that, there needs to be clear delineation of who has comparative advantage for which roles, so that we can invest in getting the predictable and accountable response required. That should reflect the right balance between immediate stabilization requirements and longer-term institution-building.

Thirdly, planning between peacekeeping missions and the funds and programmes needs to be genuinely integrated. When this Council mandates a mission, we need to be confident there is clarity on who within the United Nations will do what and that the funds and programmes have the means to ratchet up their engagement to meet these expectations. This has not been evident recently. We also want to avoid peacekeeping troops being pulled into institution-building activities, for which they are neither trained nor mandated.

Fourthly, there must be better quality and speed in civilian deployments. We look forward to the civilian capacity review, and we also look forward to the World Development Report, which will give further insight into how to improve our record in peacebuilding.

Finally, we need to give much greater focus to the perspectives and experiences of the countries themselves. We need to be better at assessing and tapping into existing capacities and to ensure assistance builds — rather than surpasses — national capabilities.

We welcome the formation of the new grouping of 17 fragile and conflict-affected countries — the so-called Group of Seven Plus that is chaired by East Timor — to provide that voice and feed into the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and

Statebuilding. We would be wise to listen to their emerging findings during the course of the year. Fragile and conflict-affected States are perhaps the best judge of, and advocate for, the performance of the United Nations and the international community.

The President: I will now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I would like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, His Excellency José Luis Guterres, and the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, His Excellency Peter Wittig, for their statements.

Having come to recognize that institution-building plays a crucial role in preventing the renewal of conflict, Bosnia and Herzegovina convened this debate to ensure that post-conflict institution-building, as such, becomes one of the priorities on the Security Council's agenda. We hope today's debate will highlight the importance of a more effective and coherent international response to this complex and challenging task.

Given the experience of my country, among others, I would like to draw the Council's attention to a few key issues.

Building accountable, legitimate and resilient institutions should be a strategic objective from the early stages of a peacebuilding process. The traditional approach leaves institution-building for a later stage, focusing first on providing humanitarian relief and rehabilitation assistance. However, it is usually too late to start developing institutional capacities when peacebuilding efforts are at the end stage. The immediate post-conflict period offers the greatest opportunity to strengthen the institutional capacities needed to see peacebuilding efforts through.

Priority has to be given to the development of those institutions that will prevent a relapse into conflict and secure the survival and renewed credibility and legitimacy of the State. While specific institutions that should be given primacy will vary from country to country, certain institutions are crucial to consolidating peace regardless of the country context, and significant efforts should be invested in their development. They are: first, institutions carrying out political functions — implementing peace agreements, carrying out elections, resolving political disputes peacefully and making and implementing laws and regulations; secondly, security and rule of law institutions; thirdly, public finance institutions; and fourthly, institutions entrusted with economic revitalization and the delivery of basic services.

The post-conflict institution-building process should be carried out based on the principle of the rule of law. All international and domestic actors in the process should fully respect a post-conflict country's constitution, its internal legal order, its international agreements, rights and obligations, including the peace agreement that ended the conflict, as well as all other applicable principles and norms of international law.

The success of post-conflict institution-building critically depends on forging between the international community and a post-conflict society a partnership that is based on a set of shared goals. When domestic and international stakeholders build consensus on a set of common goals, achieving those goals itself becomes a driving force for institution-building. That in turn stabilizes a post-conflict society by bringing all stakeholders to collaborate on a shared agenda until the risk of relapsing into conflict is eliminated.

Given the weakened and vulnerable state of post-conflict countries, the international community may initially have to assume much of the responsibility for post-conflict institution-building and, in certain cases, set up transitional institutions that carry out functions and provide services that would normally be rendered through domestic capacities. However, the objective of institution-building should be to progressively reduce dependence on the international community and promote self-reliance by creating stable, viable and responsive domestic institutions.

National ownership is a condition sine qua non for the establishment of effective institutions and the securing of sustainable peace. The transfer of responsibility from the international community to domestic actors and institutions is a very delicate and extremely important task that should be carried out in a gradual and timely manner. The installation of transitional administrative mechanisms by the international community should go hand in hand with enhancing the capacity of domestic institutions.

Peacebuilding missions should be allowed more flexibility in adjusting their institution-building activities in order to account for changes and developments on the ground. Coordination between

missions mandated by the Security Council and country teams, including development agencies and donors, must be clearly defined in order to avoid redundancy and overlapping. The assessments of the institution-building process in regular reports of Council-mandated missions need to be improved. That should also be taken into consideration when drafting resolutions for renewing mission mandates or peacebuilding configurations.

The Security Council should make greater use of the advisory role of the Peacebuilding Commission, in particular with regard to the development of viable and accountable institutions, in supporting domestic stakeholders in the countries on its agenda, identifying priority institutions to be developed and determining existing capacity gaps that require immediate and long-term support from the United Nations and the international community as a whole.

Allow me to offer two examples from Bosnia and Herzegovina. The first is our defence reform, which started in 2003 and resulted in unified modern armed forces that are operating under civilian command and with democratic oversight in accordance with commonly adopted standards. Several factors greatly contributed to the success of this process: political will and the consensus of domestic stakeholders in the first place, followed by extensive consultations, the involvement of all relevant domestic and international stakeholders, a proper and well-executed strategy, clear and coherent standards, good timing and a sufficient level of financing.

The second example is our electoral process, which in the first few post-Dayton years was organized with the extensive support of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The responsibility for the electoral process was gradually transferred to domestic authorities, so that Bosnia and Herzegovina today has full ownership of this process and the capacity to conduct fair, transparent and credible elections.

I would like to conclude by stressing that coordinated, rapid action to support post-conflict Governments in building credible and accountable institutions is of critical importance to the success of a peacebuilding process as a whole. If properly executed, such action helps restore security, legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness, thus delivering clear peace dividends. Post-conflict institution-building is a complex and demanding process, involving multiple stakeholders and the need to find a balance between achieving short-term results and long-term capacity development. The search for optimal solutions that achieve synergy in this multifaceted endeavour never ends.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

> "The Security Council recalls the previous statements of its President on post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council stresses the importance of institution-building as a critical component of peacebuilding and emphasizes the importance of a more effective and coherent national and international response to it, so that countries emerging from conflict can deliver core government functions, including managing political disputes peacefully, providing security and maintaining stability, protecting their population, ensuring respect for the rule of law, revitalizing the economy and providing basic services, which are essential to achieving durable peace. The Council emphasizes the importance of national ownership in this regard.
>
> "The Security Council underlines that the primary responsibility for successful peacebuilding lies with Governments and relevant national actors, including civil society, in countries emerging from conflict and that the United Nations can play a critical role in support of building their national institutions. The Council acknowledges the need for continued improvement in the delivery of support in the immediate aftermath of conflict in order to help stabilize the situation, whilst at the same time starting the longer-term process of institution-building, including those institutions that promote democratic processes and foster economic and social development, with a view to sustainable peace.
>
> "The Security Council emphasizes that the United Nations and the international community need to be more effective and coordinated in assessing needs and planning for effective institution-building, including how to make better use of existing national capacities and

perspectives in order to ensure national ownership. The Council stresses the need for mainstreaming support to national capacity development in all United Nations peacebuilding activities as a system-wide priority and underscores that peacebuilding strategies and institution-building should be considered in a country-specific context.

"The Security Council stresses the need for greater integration of effort, as well as predictability and accountability within the United Nations, in helping build institutions in countries emerging from conflict. The Council highlights the importance of coordinated, sector-wide and context-driven approaches in governance, economic stability, enhancing the rule of law and strengthening the security sector that must be nationally owned.

"The Security Council stresses its willingness to make greater use of the advisory role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). The Council notes the potential role the PBC can play in helping achieve critical peacebuilding objectives, including the development of viable and accountable institutions in the countries on its agenda. The Council also stresses the importance of focused and well-defined partnerships among the United Nations, development agencies, bilateral partners and all other relevant actors, in particular regional and subregional organizations, and the international financial institutions, to implement national strategies aimed at effective institution-building, which are based on the achievement of results and mutual accountability.

"The Security Council reaffirms the critical importance of timely, flexible and predictable funding for peacebuilding, including institution and capacity building, and urges Member States and other partners to increase efforts towards achieving this goal, including through the replenishment of the Peacebuilding Fund and through multi-donor trust funds, acknowledging contributions already made.

"The Security Council expresses its commitment to continuing to improve its consideration and reflection of early peacebuilding tasks related to institution-building in the mandates and composition of peacekeeping operations, special political missions and integrated peacebuilding offices, with a view to making the necessary adjustments, where appropriate, according to progress achieved, lessons learned or changing circumstances on the ground. In this context, the Council notes with appreciation the contribution that peacekeepers and peacekeeping missions make to early peacebuilding and recognizes the need to integrate mission expertise and experience into the development of peacebuilding strategies.

"The Security Council looks forward to the report of the international review of civilian capacity in early 2011, recognizing the need for improved mechanisms for timely deployment of skilled civilian experts in support of national institution-building needs in post-conflict countries. The Council requests the Secretary-General to include in the next follow-up report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict an assessment of the impact that his agenda for action has had in contributing to building viable institutions in post-conflict countries, as well as additional recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations contribution to more effective, stable and sustainable institutions that can help prevent a relapse into conflict."

This statement will be issued as document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2011/2.

I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium): I have the honour to speak also on behalf of the Permanent Representatives of Brazil, Canada, Jordan and Switzerland in our respective capacities as Chairs of the country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Burundi. We also associate ourselves with the remarks made earlier this morning by the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Wittig of Germany.

Mr. President, we welcome your initiative to hold an open debate on this important topic, and would like to take this opportunity to share lessons learned from our experience on the ground. Our intervention has three elements. First, we will present our views on the

conceptual and substantive aspects of institution-building in a post-conflict context. Secondly, we will offer suggestions on how the United Nations system could more effectively contribute to that effort. Finally, we will address the role of the Peacebuilding Commission and the country-specific Chairs in advising the Security Council.

In our experience, the process of institution-building is a critical component of post-conflict peacebuilding. Where State institutions are missing or fragile, violence more easily spreads through vulnerable societies, organized crime finds easy purchase for illegal activities, and reconciliation and recovery are delayed. The building, rebuilding and strengthening of core State functions is the sine qua non condition for overcoming conflict.

In such context, local capacity is too often overwhelmed by daunting challenges. This is evident in all five post-conflict situations on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission, despite the best efforts and commitment of the authorities concerned. One example is the lack of administrative resources in Liberia or the Central African Republic. There are only 91 magistrates available to deliver public administration services in the Central African Republic, and 13 magistrates in Liberia with proper legal training. Burundi's justice system is struggling to manage the 60 per cent of inmates awaiting trial in overcrowded prisons. In Sierra Leone, a dedicated national police force is hampered by the critical lack of available transportation.

Institution-building is about ensuring the sustainable, equitable and effective delivery of security and basic services to a national population. Functioning institutions not only protect citizens, but also empower greater participation in political decision-making, especially with respect to groups that are traditionally marginalized at the national or local levels. Critical examples include security forces that uphold human rights, a justice system that offers independent adjudication, transparent mechanisms for political participation, well-managed public administration, and effective strategies for spurring economic recovery and social development. In most post-conflict countries, it may also be important to deal with the past through processes of transitional justice and national reconciliation. Moreover, it is not enough to focus only on central Government. Conflicts often emerge from and disproportionately affect rural areas, where the extension of basic services tends to lag.

It is also important to enhance the capacity of institutions in charge of economic revitalization, public administration and the provision of basic services. These institutions are indispensable to promoting poverty reduction, which is a powerful tool for addressing some of the root causes of social strife and build long-lasting peace. Social policies may likewise have a positive impact in the political process.

While each post-conflict situation is different and there are no one-size-fits-all blueprints, our experience has yielded several useful lessons.

First, stable institutions cannot be imposed; they must be trusted and accepted by citizens. They have to be built and sustained by the individuals concerned. International institution-building efforts have to involve national actors at the outset in order to better identify and employ available local capacity. In this respect, civil society is a core pillar of institution-building, and the participation of women is of particular importance.

Secondly, institution- and State-building in post-conflict situations require sustained support from the international community. It is a matter of years, possibly even decades. It is complex. It is costly. It requires predictability of resources and the will of the international community to remain engaged for a prolonged period.

Thirdly, institution-building requires responsive financing. The catalytic role of the Peacebuilding Fund should be supported and supplemented by other national and international mechanisms that allow a similar or higher degree of speed and flexibility.

Fourthly, institution-building involves negotiating competing objectives and a readiness to accept imperfect outcomes. One constant challenge lies in managing the dilemma between the slow pace of State institution-building and popular expectations for rapid improvement. Institution-building must go hand in hand with the delivery of basic services that directly impact the everyday lives of citizens.

Finally, when assessing the institutional weaknesses of post-conflict countries, the international community should adopt a comprehensive approach and take into account the factors that hamper social and economic development. In particular, roster-holders should consider increasing the availability of experts in social and economic policy, with enhanced emphasis

on South-South expertise and greater participation by developing countries.

Allow me now to offer some suggestions on how the United Nations system could more effectively contribute to peace- and institution-building.

Starting with the role of the Security Council, the five country-specific configuration Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission believe that institution-building deserves greater and more in-depth attention. As it requires both considerable time and resources, institution-building should be addressed in the early stages of peacebuilding processes. Likewise, when considering mission mandates, the Council should take institution-building into account in a manner that retains a tight focus on core stabilization priorities and relies on the comparative advantage of other actors. The Council should also continue to mandate integrated missions to deliver a comprehensive approach to peace consolidation, including by serving as a point of coordination with other actors in the international community.

The scope and complexity of institution-building often demands a wider and more sustained focus than the Security Council is capable of providing alone. Bilateral and multilateral partners and development actors have a critical role to play. Of particular importance are regional institutions and organizations such as the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States and the East African Community. Aid coordination is also crucial for avoiding conflicting strategies, overlapping activities, critical gaps and inconsistent financing.

Within the United Nations system as a whole, there is an enduring need to better define the Organization's roles and responsibilities in key peacebuilding sectors, including institution-building. Doing so will enhance the overall efficiency of the United Nations system and enable stronger support for senior leaders in the field. In that context, relations with the World Bank and other multilateral forums, such as the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, are of crucial importance.

Closer institutional coordination is required, as cooperation with the United Nations remains too dependent on personal relationships or ad hoc arrangements in the field. Effective post-conflict institution-building also requires a wide range of specialized civilian expertise, particularly in the areas of justice, security-sector reform, governance, economic recovery and social policies. Yet, both the United Nations and the broader international community still struggle with how to develop and deploy such capacity in a timely and targeted manner. In particular, more attention needs to be paid to drawing on and building the pool of talent available in affected countries. That should be the first priority for institution-building efforts. Similarly, more work is needed to tap latent expertise within the global South.

For those reasons, it is important to further strengthen mechanisms for South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation between the North and the South. It is also clear that the United Nations can, and must, do more to provide field missions with the expertise they need. That will require the United Nations to both improve its own procedures and to serve as a platform for drawing on the wider capacity available within Member States. In that respect, the Chairs look forward to the recommendations of the review of international civilian capacities.

In the view of the Chairs, the United Nations peacebuilding architecture could be better used to foster and monitor institution-building efforts and to improve coordination among the full range of relevant actors. The Security Council should increasingly draw on, and better define, the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role, especially in terms of supporting institution-building efforts undertaken by non-Secretariat entities, providing more sustained attention to peacebuilding issues beyond the immediate scope of stabilization efforts and addressing longer-term issues that have implications stretching beyond the period that the country is likely to be on the Council's agenda.

With respect to the countries on the PBC's agenda, the country-specific configurations strive to improve coordination of institution-building efforts in accordance with the peacebuilding priorities identified with national authorities. The Security Council could benefit from the experience and knowledge of the country-specific configurations by inviting the Chairs to brief the Council regularly on the progress of institution-building and other peacebuilding efforts, by consulting with the Chairs when renewing or amending mission mandates and by considering the participation of the Chairs in Council missions to countries on the PBC's agenda.

For other post-conflict countries, the Security Council could consider establishing regular coordination mechanisms with other international and regional actors, including the World Bank. A multi-tiered approach by the PBC can play a useful role in this respect, as can groups of friends of post-conflict countries.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdalaziz (Egypt): At the outset, I would like to express my delegation's appreciation to Bosnia and Herzegovina for convening this important debate on the theme of "Post-conflict peacebuilding: institution-building", emphasizing the consistent priority that has always been stressed by Governments in post-conflict countries. I would also like to associate my remarks with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh in his capacity as coordinator of the Non-Aligned Movement for peacebuilding activities.

Over the past six years, the United Nations has been successfully shaping its peacebuilding architecture, adjusting it to address the challenges and fill in the gaps emerging from past experience in peacebuilding in post-conflict situations, as identified in the recommendations of the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the ongoing review of the international civilian capacity. We are confident that Member States will continue to support international efforts through the Organization's principal organs, which significantly contribute to peacebuilding in post-conflict countries, in particular those of the Peacebuilding Commission, along with the efforts by the Secretary-General.

In that context, Egypt is confident that the implementation of the recommendations of the Peacebuilding Commission review will contribute to further strengthening the role of the Commission in establishing the vital peacebuilding platform. Egypt is coordinating on this issue with the African Union and will present, at the African Summit to be held in a few days at the end of this month, a proposal to establish a regional centre in Cairo to support peacebuilding and institution-building capacities on the African continent.

The success of institution-building in post-conflict situations largely depends on a strategic vision that should be established on the fundamental pillars of national ownership, innovative approaches, comprehensiveness, and multi-pronged partnerships.

The doctrine of transferring responsibility for peacebuilding, and consequently institution-building, to the international community is a falsely premised one. National ownership is a sine qua non for a successful peacebuilding process. In no case can the international community, even at the stage of conflict, provide services that would otherwise be provided by national or transitional Governments. Accumulated international and regional expertise have proven that national ownership of all phases of any peacebuilding process, including institution and civilian capacity-building, is the essential requirement for the success of such efforts.

National and transitional Governments in post-conflict countries must have the responsibility in identifying peacebuilding priorities and should be at the core planning and implementation of peacebuilding strategies, supported by a vibrant national civil society and assisted by the international community. They should always maintain the ability to terminate any peacebuilding activity at any time, in true reflection of the principle of national ownership.

In this context, institution-building represents a vital component of peacebuilding strategies, requiring innovative methodologies beyond traditional approaches. The requirements for stabilizing a newly established peace in a post-conflict situation extend beyond the traditional goals of security sector reform, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, and the rule of law.

If the aforementioned goals are to be successfully realized, other vital priorities must be achieved in tandem, in particular the strengthening of economic, financial, social and political institutions and civilian capacity-building in all fields. Such an approach requires a thorough analysis of existing national capabilities and resources, as well as the challenges facing successful, comprehensive and gradual institution- and civilian capacity-building on a case-by-case basis.

The efforts of post-conflict countries to address institution- and civilian capacity-building and to respond to these challenges should be supported from the early stages by multi-pronged partnerships within and outside the United Nations system among the relevant United Nations bodies and the United Nations field operations. Furthermore, the United Nations should not be the only player in institution- and

civilian capacity-building. This responsibility should also be shared by the donor community, international institutions — in particular, international financial institutions — and relevant regional and subregional organizations, drawing in particular on the vast pool of regional and international expertise and resources.

Establishing the appropriate environment required for exit strategies of peacekeeping operations necessitates the active involvement of peacebuilders and development actors at the early stages of any peacekeeping operation. Providing the needed support to the efforts of national Governments and civil society in post-conflict countries requires innovative coordination and collaboration among the principal organs of the United Nations and within the United Nations system, as well as maximizing the benefits from the established peacebuilding architecture.

Finally, efforts to rehabilitate and establish national institutions and the capacities needed to support them, as well as creating the enabling structural, economic and social environments for their sustenance, will not meet with success without adequate, reliable, predictable and flexible funding, without conditionality or earmarking. In addition, we need to establish monitoring and follow-up mechanisms to ensure the fulfilment of national and international financial commitments needed to realize the nationally agreed institution- and civilian capacity-building priorities. They would also ensure the consistency of the priorities of international funding mechanisms, including the Peacebuilding Fund, with the national peacebuilding priorities of the concerned countries, and address the need to consider innovative methods to strengthen the resources of such mechanisms, particularly the Peacebuilding Fund.

In this connection, at the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, Egypt suggested the convening of an annual donors' conference for the Peacebuilding Fund, similar to the annual pledging conference for the Central Emergency Response Fund, in order to ensure the mobilization of increased funding for future peacebuilding activities. We hope that this proposal will garner the necessary support for its full implementation.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Apakan (Turkey): I would like thank and commend the presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina for organizing today's open debate on this important issue.

We currently have a sound conceptual framework and a better understanding of post-conflict peacebuilding, thanks to the considerable endeavours made within the United Nations system in recent years. We now need to focus more on translating this framework into concrete action, both in New York and in the field.

For its part, Turkey has been increasingly engaged in preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding efforts, which are closely interlinked. We believe it essential to use these tools within a coherent and strategic framework. Turkey placed particular emphasis on these issues during its Security Council membership. Now, together, with Finland and the Group of Friends, we are working on how to further the concept of mediation, both within the United Nations and beyond. In our view, peace mediation and facilitation efforts are the most cost-effective and efficient way of preventing and resolving conflicts.

The concept paper presented by Bosnia and Herzegovina (A/2011/16, annex) and the presidential statement just adopted (S/PRST/2011/2) contain pertinent points about a wide range of issues on the peacebuilding agenda. For this reason, and in order to adhere to the time limit for statements, I will touch upon only a few points that I deem particularly important.

First, peacebuilding is primarily a national responsibility. Hence, as has been stressed by many delegations, national ownership is of critical importance. The effective and sustainable realization of peacebuilding goals requires the active engagement of all local stakeholders, including civil society, professional associations and women's organizations. Therefore, one priority of peacekeeping operations should be to win the hearts and minds of the local people and to work together with them. This will not only inoculate the operation against criticism that it has been imposed on the national Government and population, but will also increase its success. National ownership and capacity-building are also essential elements of a successful exit strategy.

At the regional level, the support and cooperation of regional actors, particularly neighbouring countries, is another essential aspect of successful post-conflict

peacebuilding and institution-building. Many conflicts have cross-border dimensions beyond domestic political circumstances. Accordingly, the scope of conflict analysis and response needs to be broadened, not only conceptually, but also geographically.

If our peacebuilding endeavours are to succeed, we should pursue an integrated and comprehensive approach. This approach should be based on coherence among political, security, development, human rights, humanitarian and rule of law objectives. We believe that it is necessary to take complementary actions in all those areas. It is also always important to bear in mind that every country is unique. Local conditions, needs, opportunities and limitations may differ considerably. This means that the prioritization of peacebuilding and capacity-building activities must be country-specific. Strategic planning for peacebuilding activities must therefore also be sufficiently flexible.

In view of resource constraints, the success of the overall effort depends on the ability to strategically coordinate the activities of different actors. In this regard, the United Nations has a unique role to play, as it can coordinate the work of various stakeholders to deliver as one on the ground. United Nations support to regional and subregional organizations should be increased in order to develop their capacities to better perform United Nations-mandated tasks in the future.

Before concluding, let me also underline the importance of mainstreaming women's participation at all stages of the peacebuilding effort. Turkey welcomes the increasing awareness within the United Nations system and among Member States of the importance of removing constraints on women's full participation in the peacebuilding process. We look forward to the further empowerment of women's role in peacekeeping, peacebuilding and mediation endeavours.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): First of all, let me thank you, Madam, and your team for successfully conducting the Council's work during this month. At the same time, we would like to commend Bosnia and Herzegovina for selecting this important topic as the subject for this open debate. We are confident that, based on Bosnia and Herzegovina's wide experience in this field, the Council will have a successful debate and achieve mutual understanding on this important subject.

My delegation has aligned itself with and fully supports the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union. However, allow me to take part in this exceptionally relevant and timely debate by adding a few short comments in my national capacity.

One of the main purposes of every functioning State should be the prompt, efficient and sustainable delivery of core services to its citizens. Armed conflict annihilates not only this basic function of the State but, unfortunately, much more precious assets as well: human lives, health and dignity. It is thus only natural that post-conflict recovery start with emergency relief and humanitarian assistance. At the same time, it would be reasonable, if not necessary, to include in this process, from its very beginning, appropriate investment towards the recovery of the social network, on which everyday life depends. Genuine and sustainable peace can be achieved only through thorough rebuilding of core national institutions and their functions, as well as their employment on behalf of all social, religious and ethnic groups.

As we have heard time and again today, national ownership is the key tenet from which all peacebuilding efforts should start, and to which they should ultimately return. Thus reliance on and strengthening of local capacities, no matter how scarce, are fundamental preconditions for successful peacebuilding. Such an approach introduces a unique perspective otherwise not available to outsiders, consolidates necessary national governing structures and policies and paves the way for greater acceptance of a peacebuilding mission by the local population. It strengthens the hope that a peacebuilding dividend will be distributed among the local population and that peacebuilding efforts will survive long after the first appearance of signs of possible and expected donor fatigue.

In this context, Croatia is following with great interest what we hope will become a new and widespread practice of incorporating all peacebuilding efforts into a single national strategy instrument that encompasses all relevant peacebuilding programmes and activities. At the same time, Croatia believes that, on the other side of the equation, the international community, the United Nations and its agencies and all other stakeholders should attentively follow suit by unifying their actions under a proclaimed agenda, clearly dividing their roles and responsibilities and ensuring appropriate coherence and coordination in order to deliver as one.

From the very beginning, Croatia has strongly supported the establishment of the Senior Advisory Group tasked to undertake a review of international civilian capacity in order to strengthen the availability, deployability, coherence and appropriateness of civilian capacities based on an assessment of existing capacities. We very much look forward to the upcoming report on this issue.

We all agree that timely, flexible and predictable funding plays a crucial role in any peacebuilding effort. In that context, Croatia looks forward to further strengthening of a strategic partnership between the United Nations and the World Bank. We await with special interest the Bank's 2011 *World Development Report* on the theme "Conflict, security and development".

Croatia is heartened to see that broad cross-regional support for stronger peacebuilding is steadily increasing, encompassing Governments, international organizations and civil society. In that context, my country sees particular importance in further support to, and strengthening of, often feeble but steadily growing civil societies in countries that have recently emerged from conflict. Very often, civil society is precisely the necessary link between relevant international stakeholders and the strategy endorsed by the local population that requires activation in order for peacebuilding efforts to fully bear fruit.

Croatia recognizes and supports the Council's intention to further strengthen coherence among peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts in its work. In that regard, we particularly welcome the Council's practice of transforming some former peacekeeping missions into integrated peacebuilding missions. This practice perfectly fits the mandates and activities of other stakeholders in charge of peacebuilding, especially the Peacebuilding Commission, and opens the door for their further fruitful cooperation. In that context, let me add our hope that the Peacebuilding Commission's relevant knowledge and experience with respect to specific issues of countries on the agendas of both the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission will find a path to the Council's deliberations.

Croatia welcomes the Secretary-General's detailed overview of the progress achieved in implementing his agenda for action set out in his progress report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2010/386), which was recently presented to the Council (see S/PV.6396), and particularly the recommendations contained therein. We equally fully support the Secretary-General's report on women's participation in peace-building (S/2010/466) and his strategic seven-point action plan introducing necessary practical suggestions for more active engagement by women in peacebuilding processes. In that regard, we offer our support to the ongoing efforts aimed at mobilizing resources for initiatives that address women's peacebuilding needs, advance gender equality and empower women in peacebuilding contexts.

Finally, let me express once again our appreciation for the excellent report on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex), which was presented recently by the three co-facilitators and adds substantially to our comprehension of the complex issue of peacebuilding, opens new avenues for its further exploration and offers many valuable recommendations.

In conclusion, I would like to express our conviction that the new momentum witnessed in the field of peacebuilding, as well as the many valuable proposals and recommendations that have resulted from the regular and periodic reviews of peacebuilding activities, will not be wasted but will soon lead to new synergy between all relevant actors and yield eagerly awaited results.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Afghanistan.

Mr. Tanin (Afghanistan): Please allow me to begin by congratulating you, Madam, and your delegation on assuming the presidency of the Council for the month of January. I thank you for convening today's important meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding and institution-building. Our thanks also go to the Secretary-General for his remarks. I would also like to thank His Excellency Deputy Prime Minister José Luis Guterres, who spoke on behalf of the Group of Seven Plus, of which Afghanistan is a member.

Institution-building is one of the essential components in establishing a peaceful and sustainable future in any post-conflict situation. The requirements for successful institution-building in post-conflict settings include recognizing unique contexts; steady provision of resources; growth of human capital; national, regional and international cooperation; and

strategic patience through the transition period. In Afghanistan, we have learned first hand the importance of each of these requirements.

In the ubiquitous debate on the current situation in Afghanistan, it is easy to overlook the 30 years of conflict that Afghanistan has overcome in order to reach a point at which, today, we can discuss institution-building and post-conflict peacebuilding. Let us not underestimate the time it takes to surpass the challenges of history. An environment such as Afghanistan's, which has faced complex conflict, power struggles and ongoing violence for decades, cannot be changed overnight. As we engage in each and every discussion about the training of the Afghan army and police, the timeline for military engagement or international partnerships, we must keep this context in mind.

In 2001, Afghanistan was considered to be the most failed State in the world. The fall of the Taliban left a weakly governed State with no professional police or army to quell the ongoing fighting around the country. In 2001, Afghanistan lacked State institutions and had a budget of merely $27 million. After having hundreds of thousands of military and non-military Government employees in the early 1990s, educated and skilled workers fled the country and its Government was left with fewer than 2,000 employees with higher educations. Many Government institutions were non-functional because basic staffing and resourcing needs were not met.

Given the magnitude of destruction, stabilization efforts in Afghanistan have produced impressive results. Despite its uphill climb since the time of Taliban rule, Afghanistan has experienced political transformation and development over the past decade, achieved through the support of the international community. The political process for the continued growth of the country is in place. Nearly 7 million refugees have returned. Women's roles in politics have steadily increased. Civil society has emerged triumphant in a more unified and organized manner. There are many areas in the country where we are witnessing governance for the first time in decades. Progress in the area of infrastructure development, including building and paving roads and increased access to water, education and health care, has been among the most rapid of any post-conflict nation in decades. Women and girls now have equal access to education.

Security institutions have developed, supporting the emergence of Afghan national ownership. The last year has shown that it is possible to increase the Afghan National Army substantially and simultaneously to see its planning and combat abilities improve. Local administrations have increased their involvement in security efforts, particularly through the engagement of the Afghan people, especially elders, in defence programmes in villages.

As a measure to end violence and achieve lasting peace, we in Afghanistan have prioritized reintegration and reconciliation. We continue to encourage members of the armed opposition to put down their weapons, choose the path of peace and join efforts for stabilization and rehabilitation in the country. Progress continues towards implementing the recommendations of our National Consultative Peace Jirga, which constitutes the core of our reconciliation efforts. Now that we have come halfway, it is the Taliban's turn to fulfil its responsibility. If the Taliban wants to join peace talks, it must end violence and terrorist attacks, including suicide bombings, the planting of improvised explosive devices, kidnappings and targeted assassinations, and sever ties with Al-Qaida and other terrorist groups.

We must also anticipate the challenges we will face going forward. The biggest issue — not just for Afghanistan, but for any post-conflict country — is the sustainability of peace. The functionality of institutions is necessary; a country must have the resources, human capital and capacity to stop the threat of insurgency if it is to avoid relapsing into conflict. Capacity-building is essential if State institutions are to operate effectively. Empowering State institutions means enabling a national Government to provide services for its citizens.

In any post-conflict setting, sustained international engagement in the institution-building stages beyond military involvement is necessary for peacebuilding efforts to endure. In Afghanistan, an additional component of the stabilization process is effective regional cooperation. Progress is at risk of unravelling if these partnerships do not remain strong.

Democratization in post-conflict countries is a multidimensional challenge. We have learned from our experience that the democratization process requires sustained security, as well as political and development support. However, as has been emphasized time and

again, democracy grows from within and external actors can only support it. The international community and key national stakeholders must work collaboratively with integrative strategies to provide effective support for democratization.

In the coming years, national ownership and leadership with continued international partnerships will be key for Afghanistan. The adoption of the Kabul process involves greater Afghan responsibility for security, development and governance in the country. The significant increase in the amount of international funding channelled through the Afghan Government reflects renewed support for national ownership. The Afghan Government is committed to assuming full responsibility for security efforts with the support of the international community by the end of 2014. It is a gradual and conditions-based process that relies upon support for the building of the Afghan security forces' size, strength and operational capability.

Building peace by developing institutions can help address the causes of conflict. However, it is necessary to end violence in order to create an environment in which institutions can flourish. Progress can be destroyed when conflict flares up. We must not forget the lessons we have learned in Afghanistan. A school or clinic built in six months can be destroyed in only six minutes by the Taliban or other extremists. Furthermore, the importance of effective international partnerships during post-conflict situations cannot be overestimated. In this regard, adequate resourcing and capacity-building are preconditions for ensuring lasting peace.

The President: There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list for this meeting. I intend, therefore, with the concurrence of Council members, to suspend the meeting until 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.10 p.m.